

6. FPC 602.3.6 - Automatic gates may be installed for security purposes and shall provide fire department access in accordance with the following:
  - a. Entry space shall be provided for apparatus to pull off the roadway while accessing the property. The length of access driveway shall be determined by the fire official upon inspection of the site.
  - b. A manual override shall be provided in the event of electrical power failure. This may be in the form of a Medico padlock keyed to the Shelby County Fire Department key.
  - c. Electrical override of the gate shall be by Medico switch keyed to the Shelby County Fire Department key.
  - d. The minimum gate width to accommodate the fire apparatus access shall be no less than fourteen feet.
7. The nearest fire station from this location is 3.5 miles away, and the average response time for that fire station to your location is 6 minutes.

**Memphis & Shelby County Health Department-** No objections.

1. If any monitoring wells were installed as part of an environmental site assessment they must be filled as outlined in Section 6 of the Shelby County Well Construction Code.
2. If any abandoned water wells are present on this site they must be properly filled and abandoned as outlined in Section 9 of the Shelby County Well Construction Code.
3. Since this is a Planned Development that could require the demolition of a structure or structures at this site before any demolition the developer will need to fill out the attached questionnaire.
4. If a Demolition Permit will be required after filling out the questionnaire then the owner, developer, or contractor must contact the Asbestos Branch in the Air Pollution Control Section at (901) 544-7349 in order to secure the appropriate permit.

**Memphis Board of Education:** No comments received.

**Shelby County Board of Education:** No comments received.

**Construction Code Enforcement:** No comments received.

**Memphis Light, Gas and Water:**

MLGW has reviewed the referenced application, and has no objection, subject to the following comments:

- The subject property is encumbered by an existing utility right of way easement, which may include overhead and underground facilities. MLGW prohibits any development or improvements within the Easement, except as provided by the **MLGW Right of Way Encroachment Policy**.
- **It is the responsibility of the owner/applicant**, prior to any development, to contact **Ronnie Alberson, Land Rights Specialist, with MLGW @ 528-4186** and obtain written approval for any improvements within the Easement.
- **It is the responsibility of the owner/applicant** to pay the cost of any work performed by MLGW to install, remove or relocate any facilities to accommodate the proposed development.

- **It is the responsibility of the owner/applicant** to identify any utility easements, whether dedicated or prescriptive (electric, gas, water, CATV, telephone, sewer, drainage, etc.), which may encumber the subject property, including underground and overhead facilities. No permanent structures will be allowed within any utility easements.
- **It is the responsibility of the owner/applicant** to comply with the **National Electric Safety Code (NESC)** and maintain minimum horizontal/vertical clearances between existing overhead electric facilities and any proposed structures.
- **Landscaping is prohibited** within any MLGW utility easement. No trees, shrubs or permanent structures will be allowed within any MLGW utility easements.
- **It is the responsibility of the owner/applicant** to contact **TN-1-CALL @ 1.800.351.1111**, before digging, and to determine the location of any underground utilities including electric, gas, water, CATV, telephone, etc
- **It is the responsibility of the owner/applicant** to submit a detailed plan to MLGW Engineering for the purposes of determining the availability and capacity of existing utility services to serve any proposed or future development(s).
- **Fire Protection Water Services:** **It is the responsibility of the owner/applicant** to contact MLGW - **Water Engineering @ 528-4720** to obtain fire protection/water flow information. If water main extensions and/or an increase in existing main sizes are needed to meet the minimum fire flow rate to serve the proposed development, the owner/applicant will be responsible for the cost of these improvements.
  - Please refer to Section 12.1.1 and Appendix A of the **MLGW Water Service Policy Manual**, which is available online at the following MLGW website: [http://www.mlgw.com/images/water\\_manual.pdf](http://www.mlgw.com/images/water_manual.pdf)
- **It is the responsibility of the owner/applicant** to contact the appropriate MLGW engineering area to determine if system improvements may be required and any related cost:
  - MLGW Engineering - **Residential Development:** 528-4858
  - MLGW Engineering - **Commercial Development:** 367-3343
- **It is the responsibility of the owner/applicant** to pay the cost of any utility system improvements necessary to serve the proposed development with electric, gas or water utilities.

**AT&T:**

AT&T has no comment on this development at this time.

**Memphis Area Transit Authority (MATA):**

No comments received.

**OPD-Transportation Planning:**

Based on our 2030 LRTP, the extent of Walnut Grove (from Houston Levee to Rocky Point) and Houston levee (from Raleigh LaGrange to Humphrey road), for year 2017, have been identified as reaching the Level of Service (LOS)-F and LOS-E, which is the worst congestion scenario. Based upon the size of the two PD's, this will make the traffic conditions even worse in this area. Additionally, by eliminating the original NS route, it will create further traffic congestion and that too very close to the intersection of Walnut Grove and Houston Levee, which is a very busy intersection, during the peak hours. If the NS route is kept then that will divide and divert the traffic and give the drivers an additional option of accessing a major road. Hence, we recommend to keep the North-South route.

**See Figure 2, Congested Corridors Map-Page 6** for our 2030 LRTP that shows the congested network fro 2017 (We have highlighted the Study Area).



**OPD-Plans Development:**

1. The proposed development is in an area of the Gray's Creek Area Plan proposed for low density residential development, defined as an average of 1-acre lots or greater. It is noted that lot sizes may be less than 1 acre if cluster option exercised, but this proposal does not use that option. Cluster development would provide for more open space and reduce the amount of impervious cover by allowing for smaller networks of streets and utilities.
2. Furthermore, much of the proposed development is in the floodplain. The Gray's Creek Area Plan emphasizes that a lower density be used if development is allowed in environmentally sensitive areas. Also, the Gray's Creek Area Plan states that the floodplain of Gray's Creek should be utilized for a system of open spaces and greenways to serve the future residential population. Only part of floodplain in this proposal is used for open space.
3. The Gray's Creek Area Plan specifies nodes for commercial development located at major intersections. This proposal violates the Gray's Creek Area Plan in proposing commercial development outside of these designated areas and not at a major intersection.
4. Overall, this proposed development does not conform to the specifications or the intent of the Gray's Creek Area Plan.

**Neighborhood Associations:**

*Gray's Creek Association:*

*See Attachments.*

*Alliance of Cordova Neighborhoods:*

*No comments received as of 11/7/'08.*

*Fisherville Civic Club:*

*" "*

*Cordova Leadership Council:*

*No comments received as of 11/7/'08.*

*Hollow Grove Ngh'd Association:*

*No comments received as of 11/7/'08.*

*Kentwood Estates Ngh'd Association:*

*" "*

*Rocky Point Ngh'd Association:*

*No comments received as of 11/7/'08.*

**Staff: bb**

**OPPOSITION LETTERS**

**From:** driffe [driffe@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Sunday, November 02, 2008 8:26 AM

**To:** Bacchus, Brian

**Subject:** P.D. 08-324 CC

I would like to see more information on exactly what is planned for the area in question. While I am not in objection to having assisted living/nursing home facilities in this location, I am troubled by the open-ended request for minimum lot sizes of 6,000 square feet. Having a few of these in a nice, planned retirement community is one thing, but packing the whole area with small houses and more traffic than the roads in this area of the county are designed to handle is quite another. The request says nothing about small lots being related to any kind of planned retirement community, so I must assume that this is not part of the plan.

A few years ago, this community went to great lengths to negotiate with a developer and the Office of Planning and Development about the appropriate use of this property. A key point in the final decision in that matter was that Trinity Road would be extended out to Houston-Levee to provide a route out of the area, other than all of those people being routed through our formerly quiet, dead-end neighborhood streets in Woodland Hills and down tiny Humphreys Road, which is not wide enough for two large vehicles to pass without one getting off of the pavement. Houses have been built in the area in question, but the promise to extend Trinity has not been fulfilled. In my opinion, this is the most important aspect of any development of the property in question.

Too much housing density has already been allowed this part of the county for the infrastructure we have to handle traffic. No one in government seems to get it or to care. Instead of looking at each individual development request in isolation, look at the whole area. There is no going around the block when a traffic accident occurs or when you can't turn left onto Houston-Levee because of the nonstop traffic. The area bounded by Houston-Levee, Walnut Grove, Sanga, and Macon has no connectors or alternative traffic routes. All of the traffic in or out of neighborhoods in this large "square" must go on these boundary roads. Please consider improving the infrastructure with some alternative routing before trying to fill up every last piece of open space in this bounded area with additional houses and cars.

Regards,

Don A. Riffe  
9685 Woodland Run Lane  
Cordova, TN 38018

**OPPOSITION LETTERS**

**From:** kenneth a rutherford [kenneth\_rutherford@msn.com]

**Sent:** Friday, November 07, 2008 8:48 AM

**To:** Bacchus, Brian

**Subject:** RE: Woodland Hills, Amended P.D. 08-324cc

Brian,

Thank you for the information that you have forwarded. As a property owner in the neighborhood, I am very opposed to this amendment. There has already been an approved plan that many of us relied upon in making life decisions. Such a major alteration now will not only negatively impact property values in the area, but will negatively impact quality of life for those of us trying to make Shelby County our home. This type of amendment if allowed will also go to discredit Shelby County Govt. in their plan for smart and reasoned development of such areas. Please have those voting on this amendment drive over to Walnut Bend and G'Town Road and see all of the doctor offices and such businesses that are vacant and deteriorating. Then have them go see the area near Hillshire and Whitten, where a similiar plan was attempted, only to end in a blight on the neighborhood.

This is a poorly designed plan, as there is already a glut of smaller lot/homes in the neighborhood - drive by any of the newer constrution areas such as Breezy Valley, etc. We have plenty of entry level homes in the area, many of which are recent foreclosures. There is a newer Senior center being developed on Dexter and there are units still for sale in that development. Where is the study to show that such a need for added senior housing is needed, and that the market can support this project?

Thank you,  
Ken Rutherford  
(901) 626-3116



**OPPOSITION LETTERS**

Mr. Bacchus:

I would like to reiterate some of the concerns my husband relayed in his original message to you.

1. Traffic that would be generated by putting more houses (i.e. smaller lots) in the area, UNLESS they are strictly for senior citizens. If these are for starter homes, then we would be adding significantly to the already burdened traffic with two car families and young adults headed to work. Senior citizens may have two cars, but the timing of their travel patterns would not necessarily be during the work rush hours.
2. Trinity Road has not been completed through to Houston Levee as PROMISED by the Mr. Eldridge in his original plan that was approved (after much discussion and input from the neighborhood). This must be done before any further development is done.
3. I would also like to ask that Humphries Road be made into a true two lane road as part of this request (should this project plan be approved).

Mr. Eldridge changes his plans often for his financial gain. Even the original plans for Woodland Hills were changed by him once he sold the original lots. He is forever making changes and getting approvals that benefit HIM and not the neighborhood of people who pay the taxes.

Something must be done soon to stop all the development in this area. Even the work in progress on Houston Levee is not adequate to handle the current traffic denseness and here we are looking to put more people into this square mile. Please put the brakes on this or make the developer pay to enhance the roads.

Thank you for your consideration.

Renelda Riffe  
9685 Woodland Run Lane  
Cordova, TN 38018

LETTER-GRAY'S CREEK ASSOCIATION

November 3, 2008

Mary Baker, Deputy Director  
Shelby County Office of Planning and Development  
125 North Main Street  
Memphis, TN 38103

RE: WOODLAND HILLS II PD; CANALE GROVE PD

Dear Ms. Baker:

The Gray's Creek Association recently met with representatives of both referenced Planned Developments and recommend approval with the following provisions:

Woodland Hills PD

1. Trinity Road dedication east to Houston Levee.
2. ~~No direct roadway connectivity from Trinity Road south to Walnut Grove.~~
3. Any public roadway shall connect to Canale Grove PD street stub south of lake.
4. N/S street in Area 5 designed for traffic calming element.
5. The Woodland Hills PD may be developed as a private gated development.

Comment [c1]: Requirement for a direct/public

Comment [c2]: ie; the design should minimize long straight streets.

Comment [c3]: Not sure if this would be item 6, but the parcel at the southern end which is not residential in use would have public connection to Walnut Grove and ALSO connect to Canale Grove PD.

Comment [c4]: This is the north/west portion of the site. This area is to also provide connection to Woodland Hills PD if uses are compatible. If uses are not compatible then a connection to and from Woodland Hills PD shall be provided just south of this portion.

Comment [c5]: This connection should be both to the south parcels of Canale Grove and also provide for possible future connection to the north which is not part of this application.

Comment [c6]: The MLGW parcels are currently only reserve areas for possible pumping stations. These uses along this important roadway could/should be moved to less visual locations to allow Canale Grove PD the opportunity to provide the highest level of streetscape possible.

Canale Grove PD

1. Multi-Family or retirement community area may be ~~gated~~.
2. Connection of the Woodland Hills PD multi-family area and the Canale Grove multi-family area may be developed as a single overall complex as multi-family or retirement-type senior living, if the parties agree.
3. Provide for future driveway connectivity from NE retail to property adjacent to the north, if the parties ~~agree~~.
4. If possible, relocate MLGW facilities from Walnut Grove.

Thank you,

David Sanders  
Gray's Creek Association